

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	2:24-cv-08211-RGK-MAR	Date	December 2, 2024
Title	Eddie Golikov v. Walmart Inc.		

Present: The Honorable	R. GARY KLAUSNER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
Joseph Remigio	Not Reported		N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder		Tape No.
Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:		Attorneys Present for Defendant:	
Not Present		Not Present	

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order Re: Stipulation to Stay Case [DE 20]

On September 24, 2024, Eddie Golikov (“Plaintiff”) filed a Class Action Complaint against Walmart Inc. (“Defendant”) asserting various state law claims arising from Defendant’s alleged false labeling of avocado oil. (ECF No. 1.) As it turns out, this case is one of many, as similar actions had been filed in Massachusetts, Arizona, Illinois, and New York. On October 23, 2024, the plaintiffs in several of these actions filed a Motion to Transfer pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 with the Judicial Panel of Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”), seeking to transfer all such cases to a single district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings. Motion to Transfer, *In re: Avocado Oil Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, MDL No. 3133 (JPML, Oct. 23, 2024), ECF No. 1. As of November 25, 2024, the Motion has been fully briefed, but remains unassigned and not yet scheduled for a hearing.

Presently before the Court is the parties’ Stipulation to Stay Case Pending the JPML’s Ruling on the Motion to Transfer. (ECF No. 20.) The parties argue that a temporary stay would be in the interest of judicial economy because it may eliminate duplicative briefing or unnecessary use of judicial resources.

A district court has “broad discretion to stay proceedings as an incident to its power to control its own docket.” *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997) (citing *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)). At this time, the Court is not convinced that there is sufficient good cause to stay the matter. While the JPML’s decision may impact the current case, there is no indication of when that decision will be made. Given the lack of assignment and hearing date, it seems unlikely that decision will be made by until sometime next year. Therefore, in the interest of justice and judicial economy, the Court finds that a stay at this juncture is not warranted. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** the Stipulation.

The Court notes, however, that Defendant’s deadline to respond to the Complaint is today, December 2, 2024. Out of caution, the Court extends Defendant’s response deadline to December 9, 2024.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	2:24-cv-08211-RGK-MAR	Date	December 2, 2024
Title	<i>Eddie Golikov v. Walmart Inc.</i>		

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

JRE/sf